



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,108	04/26/2001	Arthur Tauber	CECOM 5469	1631

7590 05/29/2003

U.S. Army Communications-Electronics Command  
ATTN: AMSEL-LG-L (George B. Tereschuk, Esq.)  
Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703

EXAMINER

BOS, STEVEN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1754

DATE MAILED: 05/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/845,108

Applicant(s)

Tauber et al

Examiner

Steven Bos

Art Unit

1754

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 5, 2003
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-79 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 23, 26, 29, 32, 35, 38, 41, 44 is/are withdrawn from consideration. <sup>-49</sup>
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 12, 18, 24, 30, 33, 39, 42, and 50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, 25, 27, 28, 31, 34, 36, 37, 40, and 43 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 14
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
**09/845,108**

Applicant(s)  
**Tauber et al**

Examiner  
**Steven Bos**

Art Unit  
**1754**



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Steven Bos

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) George B. Tereschuk

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Mar 10, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: None

Identification of prior art discussed:

Fesenko

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed Fesenko reference and the obtaining of a translation of same.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

**STEVEN BOS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 1754**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Art Unit: 1754

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on May 5, 2003 has been entered.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4,6,12,50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the journal article by Fesenko, et al.

Fesenko teaches the instantly claimed compounds which would have dielectric characteristics since the stoichiometry of the taught compounds is the same as that instantly claimed and thus would function as a dielectric substrate.

Where the claimed and prior art product(s) are identical or substantially identical, the burden of proof is on applicant to establish that the prior art product(s) do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of the instantly claimed product(s), see *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430.

Claims 1-3,6,18,24,33,39,42,50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the journal article by Wittmann, et al.

Wittmann teaches the instantly claimed compounds which would have dielectric characteristics since the stoichiometry of the taught compounds is the same as that instantly claimed and thus would function as a dielectric substrate.

Where the claimed and prior art product(s) are identical or substantially identical, the burden of proof is on applicant to establish that the prior art product(s) do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of the instantly claimed product(s), see *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430.

Claims 1,2,30,50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the journal article by Blasse.

Blasse teaches the instantly claimed compounds which would have dielectric characteristics since the stoichiometry of the taught compounds is the same as that instantly claimed and thus would function as a dielectric substrate.

Where the claimed and prior art product(s) are identical or substantially identical, the burden of proof is on applicant to establish that the prior art product(s) do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of the instantly claimed product(s), see *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430.


Claims 7,9,10,13,15,16,19,21,22,25,27,28,31,34,36,37,40,43 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Applicant's arguments filed May 5, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., cubic or pseudo-cubic tetragonal crystalline structure) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Fesenko teaches a cubic perovskite crystalline structure for  $\text{Sr}_2\text{LuSbO}_6$ . See pp. 3,4 of the translation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Bos whose telephone number is (703) 308-2537. The examiner is on the increased flexitime program schedule and can normally be reached between 8AM and 6PM Monday through Friday. The FAX No. for After Final amendments is 703-872-9311; for all others it is 703-872-9310. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

  
Steven Bos  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1754